<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1-27 and 36-40 are pending.

Claims 28-35 have been cancelled, without prejudice.

Claim 41 has been added.

In the Office Action dated April 23, 2009, claims 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Link (U.S. Patent No. 5,270,937); claims 1-2, 11, 16, 26-27 and 36-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Link in view of Ikeda (U.S. Patent No. 6,185,343); claims 3-5, 7-8, 12-15, 20, 22-25 and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Link in view of Ikeda and further in view of Yokota (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0102898); claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Link in view of Ikeda and further in view of Craport (U.S. Patent No. 5,796,634); and claims 6 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Link in view of Ikeda and further in view of Kapolka (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0163249).

<u>REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102</u>

Independent claim 17 was rejected as purportedly anticipated by Link.

Claim 17 now recites a method for detecting a crossing of a border between different jurisdictions, comprising:

- retrieving data defining at least one rectangle that represents the border between the different jurisdictions;

- receiving information relating to a current location of a monitored device; and

- comparing, by a processor, the current location with the at least one rectangle using the data defining the at least one rectangle, wherein a determination that the current location is located within the at least one rectangle indicates a border crossing by the monitored between the different jurisdictions.

Support for the amendment of claim 17 regarding crossing a border between different jurisdictions can be found at least in the following passage of the specification: page 5, line 22 – page 9, line 18.

It is clear that Link clearly does not provide any teaching or hint of retrieving data defining at least one rectangle that represents the border between different jurisdictions. Rather, in Link, a current position of a vehicle is determined by a navigation system, and

a rectangle of interest around the estimated vehicle coordinates is determined for the purpose of identifying which road segments are within the rectangle of interest so that the estimated coordinates of the vehicle as determined by the navigation system can be corrected. Link, 2:13-47; 4:31-55. Thus, the rectangle of interest that is used in Link clearly does not represent a border between different jurisdictions.

With respect to other claims, however, the Office Action had cited Yokota as purportedly disclosing a navigation system that detects when a user has crossed a state border. *See* 4/23/2009 Office Action at 6 (rejection of dependent claims over Link, Ikeda, and Yokota). Although Yokota does refer to a vehicle crossing a border between two states (*see* Yokota, ¶ [0051]), and Yokota does make reference to a navigation system detecting a current location of a vehicle for the purpose of searching for traffic rules and other information unique to the location of the vehicle (*see* Yokota, ¶ [0080]), Yokota provides absolutely no hint of defining at least one rectangle that represents a border between different jurisdictions. None of the other references provide any teaching or hint of the foregoing subject matter.

Therefore, claim 17 is clearly allowable over the cited references.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 OVER LINK AND IKEDA

Independent claim 1 was rejected as purportedly obvious over Link and Ikeda. Note that the amendments made to claim 1 are provided for clarification purposes, to improve the form of the claim, and are not made in response to the rejection of claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is non-obvious over Link and Ikeda.

To make a determination under 35 U.S.C. § 103, several basic factual inquiries must be performed, including determining the scope and content of the prior art, and ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue. *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17, 148 U.S.P.Q. 459 (1965). Moreover, as held by the U.S. Supreme Court, it is important to identify a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine reference teachings in the manner that the claimed invention does. *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1741, 82 U.S.P.Q.2d 1385 (2007).

Here, even if Link and Ikeda could be hypothetically combined, the hypothetical combination of the references would not have led to the claimed subject matter. As conceded by the Office Action, Link fails to disclose "rotation of the determined coordinates with respect to the particular rectangle, associated with a current location, by an angle of rotation relating to the particular rectangle." 4/23/2009 Office Action at 4. More specifically, it appears that the Office Action is conceding that Link fails to disclose the following elements of claim 1:

- **rotating**, by a processor, the received set of coordinates by an **angle** between a selected side of a particular rectangle of the boundary and an axis of the coordinate system; and

- comparing, by the processor, the **rotated** set of coordinates to a **rotated** rectangle to determine whether the location of the monitored device is located within the particular rectangle, wherein the particular rectangle is **rotated** by the **angle** to form the **rotated** rectangle such that the selected side of the **rotated** rectangle is oriented parallel to the axis of the coordinate system.

The Office Action cited Ikeda as purportedly disclosing claimed subject matter missing from Link. *Id.*, at 4-5. It is respectfully submitted that Ikeda clearly fails to provide any teaching or hint of the claimed subject matter that is not disclosed by Link. Ikeda relates to a position detection system used for finding a rotation angle and a coordinate of a check object that is contained in an input image captured by a TV camera. Ikeda, 1:11-15; 2:31-36; 3:9-22. For example, in Fig. 1 of Ikeda, the check object is identified as P, and reference templates are represented as T0 and T1. Reference template T0 is not rotated. On the other hand, reference templates T1 are rotated with respect to the reference template T0. *Id.*, 4:45-61. The check object P is then collated with the reference templates T0 and T1 to determine the best correlation between the check object P and the reference templates T0 and T1 such that the angle of rotation of the checked object P can be ascertained. *Id.*, 4:61-5:9.

In the passage in column 3 of Ikeda cited by the Office Action (column 3, lines 9-22), reference is made to preparing a reference template having a reference image of the checked object, and rotating the reference template at various rotation angles. The cited column 3 passage of Ikeda also refers to collating the reference template with the check

image to evaluate correlations between the check image and the reference templates at various rotation angles. The best match would reveal a rotation angle of the check object.

In the process described by Ikeda, the coordinates of the check object are not first rotated and then compared to a rotated rectangle – instead, the process of Ikeda is used for detecting an angle of rotation of the checked object as captured by an input device such as a camera. Other passages of Ikeda cited by the Office Action (column 4, lines 51-56; column 9, lines 10-60; column 10, lines 56-64) merely describe various alternative embodiments of the general process described above.

It is also noted that Ikeda provides absolutely no hint of rotating any rectangle such that a side of the rotated rectangle is oriented parallel to the axis of a coordinate system.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that even if Link and Ikeda could be hypothetically combined, the hypothetical combination of these references would not have led to the claimed subject matter.

Moreover, a person of ordinary skill in the art clearly would not have been prompted to combine the teachings of Link and Ikeda to achieve the claimed subject matter, in view of the fact that neither Link nor Ikeda provides any hint of first rotating a set of coordinates associated with a location of a monitored device, and then comparing such rotated coordinates to a rotated rectangle to determine whether the location of the monitored devices are located within a particular rectangle (where the particular rectangle is rotated by the angle to form the rotated rectangle such that the selected side of the rotated rectangle is oriented parallel to the axis of the coordinate system).

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claim 1 has been overcome.

Independent claim 36 is similarly allowable over Link and Ikeda.

CONCLUSION

Dependent claims, including newly added claim 41, are allowable for at least the same reasons as corresponding independent claims. In view of the allowability of base claims, the obviousness rejections of dependent claims have also been overcome.

In view of the foregoing, allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees and/or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 (200901480-1).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 21, 2009   /Dan C. Hu/
                                          Dan C. Hu
                                          Registration No. 40,025
                                          TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
                                          1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
                                          Houston, TX 77057-2631
                                          Telephone: (713) 468-8880
                                          Facsimile: (713) 468-8883